

Question 2

Section B: American Option

The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

Lincoln and Disunion, 1861

- 2 Read the sources and then answer **both** parts of the question.

Source A

No state, upon its own mere motion, can lawfully get out of the Union. Acts of violence against the authority of the United States are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances. I therefore consider that the Union is unbroken. I shall take care that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the states. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace but only the declared purpose of the Union that it will constitutionally defend itself. In doing this there needs be no bloodshed or violence, unless it be forced on the national authority. The power confided in me will be used to hold, occupy and possess the property and places belonging to the government and to collect duties. There will be no invasion – no using of force against or among the people anywhere.

From Abraham Lincoln's first inaugural address, 4 March 1861.

Source B

If I understand the inaugural speech aright, that purpose which seems to stand out clearly and directly is one which must lead to war against the confederate or seceding states. I must say frankly to gentlemen on the other side that I do not see how, if we adopt the principles of the inaugural, that is to be avoided.

The President declares expressly that he intends to treat those states as though they were still members of the Union, as though the acts of secession were nothing. As they claim to be independent, there can be no result except a collision. In plain, unmistakable language he declares that it is his purpose to hold, occupy and possess the forts and arsenals in those states. We know that he can hold them only by dispossessing the state authorities.

From a speech in the US Senate by Thomas Clingman, Democratic Senator for North Carolina, 6 March 1861.

Source C

I submit to the Senate that the friends of peace have much to rejoice at in the inaugural address of the President. It is a much more conservative document than I had anticipated. It is a much more pacific and conciliatory document than I had expected. After examination, I am clearly of the opinion that the administration stands pledged by the inaugural to a peaceful solution of all our difficulties, to do no act that leads to war and to change its policy just so often and whenever change is necessary to preserve the peace.

From a speech in the US Senate by Stephen Douglas, Democratic Senator for Illinois, 4 March 1861.

Question 2, continued

Source D

For the comfort of secessionists who have denounced Lincoln for the ‘declaration of war’ which they contend is contained in his inaugural speech, we copy the following extract from the National Anti-Slavery Standard of 9 March. This fanatical paper is as bitter against Lincoln for *not* declaring war as the secessionists are abusive of him for a pretence that he has declared war. The two extremes are acting together in favour of disunion.

‘The [inaugural] speech was made with the face turned towards the South and with both knees bowed down before the idol it worships. Lincoln should have plainly set forth the encroachments of slavery upon the rights of the North and shown how they had culminated in the disruption of the Union. He should have proclaimed his intention of stopping the encroachments and restoring the Union by the full exercise of all his constitutional power. Then he would have taken a position which even his enemies would have admired.’

From the Fayetteville (North Carolina) ‘Observer’, 14 March 1861.

Answer **both** parts of the question with reference to the sources.

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and B on the likelihood of secession leading to war. [15]
- (b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that President Lincoln’s inaugural address was bound to lead to war? [25]

Mark scheme

Section B: American Option

The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

Lincoln and Disunion, 1861

Indicative Content

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and B on the likelihood of secession leading to war. [15]**

Source A, from Lincoln's first speech as President, argues that secession is unlikely to lead to civil war. First of all, he denies that a state can secede 'upon its own mere motion', which means that he refuses to acknowledge the secessions which occurred between the federal election and his inauguration. He finally states that the federal government will not use force against the people 'anywhere'. However, in between, he does say that bloodshed is possible if the federal government's authority is challenged. Thus there is a possibility that secession will lead to war but the federal government will not be the one to start it.

Source B, from a Southern Democrat, argues that secession is bound to lead to war. The seceded states see themselves as having left the USA, as being independent. The US President argues that no state has left the Union as it cannot do so on its own. When the president acts to control federal forts in seceded states, as he says he will, war is bound to follow. If the differences are clear, so are some similarities. Neither source wants to be seen as starting the war; both sources need to find ways of justifying their side going to war should it break out.

- (b) How far do Sources A–D support the view that President Lincoln's inaugural address was bound to lead to war? [25]**

Context: President Lincoln made his address in March 1861, five months after he won the presidential election – and that he did by winning most Northern states. He was a sectional president who had to address a great national problem. In the South, he was not on the ballot for the seven states which seceded between December 1860 and February 1861. Southerners saw Lincoln as either an abolitionist or too weak to stand up to the abolitionists. Even before the election, many in the South argued that to choose Lincoln would be to choose disunion. In the next five months, a lame-duck Buchanan presidency did nothing to confront disunionist forces in the South. The secession of the seven states meant that the likelihood of conflict between North and South was much greater than it had been at election time. In March, war had still not yet occurred and Lincoln's speech was as conciliatory to the South as possible – without conceding the right of states to secede unilaterally. The practical issue of control of federal territory in seceded states remained a major problem, however, and five weeks after the speech political divisions gave way to military conflict as the state of South Carolina bombarded Fort Sumner.

Mark scheme, continued

Analysis: Source A provides evidence of Lincoln's approach to the secession problem, which is best described as unyielding yet unprovocative. He is not going to accept secession but neither is he going to order federal forces to invade secessionist states. He will defend the Union, however, and uphold federal law in all the states of the USA. Thus Source A rejects the assertion even if it accepts that war *might* result.

Source B takes the opposite stance. The North Carolina Democrat argues that the Southern states see themselves as having broken away from the USA. However cautious Lincoln might be in keeping control of federal forts in disunited states, the South is bound to oppose him, by force if necessary. Source C supports the view that the inaugural address is not bound to lead to war as Douglas maintains that Lincoln will make any concession necessary to keep the peace. Source D is a Southern report of an abolitionist newspaper article which criticises Lincoln as making too many concessions to the South. Thus Source D suggests that Lincoln is not set on war with the South, that war is not bound to occur. Only Source B argues that it is.

Evaluation: Source A is Lincoln's first public address as federal president when he is facing constitutional and political problems of unprecedented complexity. He has just taken an oath of office by which he agreed to 'preserve, protect and defend' the constitution of the USA. Seven states have refused to accept his authority. He has to speak to and for all parts of the USA. Source A shows Lincoln steering a careful line between concession and compulsion. To abolitionists, according to Source D, this is a sign of weakness. Southern politicians, as in Source B, understand Lincoln's position but believe it makes war unavoidable. Context shows how narrow a path Lincoln had to walk by the time he took office. Emotions were running high, especially in the South, and his best efforts to defend the constitution failed to prevent the probable becoming unavoidable just a few weeks later.

Source B is a public speech made by a Southern senator just two days after Lincoln's inaugural address. The extract is quite an accurate description of the situation facing the USA and its president, which is a surprise as it comes in a public speech made by a Democrat from a state which was soon to secede. The source shows the importance of different perceptions and how they affect arguments and actions.

Source C is a public speech made by a Northern Democrat and the defeated rival of Lincoln. Again, his speech is something of a surprise as he praises Lincoln for his inaugural address. His analysis falters when he asserts that the federal government has 'to do no act which leads to war and to change its policy' whenever needed to keep the peace. Source A shows Lincoln is not so accommodating and thus undermines Source C.

Source D contains two arguments in one. It contains the abolitionists' argument that Lincoln should stand firm against the South. It also contains the Fayetteville *Observer's* use of that argument to address Southern extremists. It is unclear whether the *Observer* was or was not keen on secession and war. Certainly abolitionists were willing to risk war in order to defend the constitution and defeat slave power. Many Northerners, including Lincoln himself, had believed that Southern talk of secession was bluff. Even after Lincoln's inauguration, many believed war was avoidable. Events in South Carolina were to prove them wrong. The evaluated sources support a modified version of the assertion, namely that Lincoln's inaugural address made war much more probable.

Example candidate response – high

2a)	There are many similarities and differences between Sources A and B on the likelihood of secession leading to war.
	Among the similarities is that both sources agree that the Confederacy's annexation of property has caused much dissent and sectional strife. A says that he will In A, Lincoln says that he will 'hold, occupy and possess' the the Union's territory, referring to the Union Confederacy's annexed territ property which he views as 'insurrectionary'. A

Example candidate response – high, continued

B agrees, stating that Lincoln's speech on the Confederacy annexing territories is 'one which must lead to war against the confederate.' Both agree in ~~A~~ Lincoln's speech in A was specifically tailored to appeal to the patriotism of Americans and dissuade ^{further} secession by the Confederacy, ~~written~~ Southern states as well as hoping to persuade already seceded states to rejoin the Union. Therefore, his words are likely to carry much weight, especially so since his inaugural address was during a period of great sectionalism. This is likely to make his speech reliable to an extent, even if mildly tarnished by its ~~not~~ other motive to rally the patriotic fervor of the Union. ~~C~~ Clingman's words carry weight too, ~~especially since~~ perhaps more so than Lincoln. This is due to it being in the US Senate where he would have had to persuade all Senators to back his point of argument. Clingman had no political ambitions whatsoever and lying would have been futile in ^{when even South Carolina seceded,} a period of great sectionalism, making his words as reliable as Lincoln's. Hence, both sources agree that the Confederacy's secession has caused much sectionalism, with the possibility of some form of violence should they resist ~~the~~ re-amalgamation with the Union as it takes back the territories. The main difference is that Lincoln makes implicit ~~reference to~~ ~~some form of punishment going to be carried~~ threat to the Confederacy ^{if they try resisting} through the use of 'insurrectionary', implying they are criminals, whereas Clingman is far more direct with the use of 'must lead to war.'

Among the differences between A and B on whether secession will lead to war is one of honesty. In A, Lincoln hints that no state can 'lawfully get out of the Union' and that he will 'consider the Union unbroken!' On the other hand, B is point blank in its assertion

Example candidate response – high, continued

	<p>that 'there can be no result except a collision' when if following the Lincoln's 'inaugural speech' that hopes to preserve the Union by any means necessary. Source B is likely to be more reliable in this context as Clingman would not have had the burden and difficulty of rallying Union support like Lincoln, and so would not have had to wince his words. Lincoln on the other hand stresses 'There will be no invasion.' Using contextual knowledge, this is likely to be untrue as Lincoln was prepared to use force to preserve the Union in conversations he had with Seward. Coupled with his burden of rallying the Union in a time of great political unrest that would force him to be more optimistic and rally Union patriotism, this faints the his assertion, making B's assertion that secession will lead to war is inevitable carry more weight.</p>
	<p>Overall, although both sources agree that the secession has provoked much sectional ^{sectional} tension and that re-amalgamation re-amalgamation of the Union is necessary, they differ in their their approach to whether section secession will cause war. A says it shouldn't so long as the Confederacy peacefully rejoins the Union whilst B counters by saying secession ^{war} is inevitable as repossessing seceded property will provoke war from ^{with} the Confederacy who will want to retain their property.</p>
2b)	<p>Source B supports the view that Lincoln's inaugural address was bound to lead to war. Clingman muses on Lincoln's possible short sightedness in viewing the Confederacy as 'members of the Union, as though the acts of secession were nothing.' This is very true as Lincoln proclaims that he would 'consider that the Union is unbroken' in Source A. B's assertion is far more likely to be reliable the as</p>

Example candidate response – high, continued

Clingman did not have the burden of uniting a nation much like Lincoln did in his inaugural address, at the a period when most of the lower South had seceded and the Upper South ~~was vacillating on doing so.~~ ~~and too, thereby~~ breaking the Union. ~~Morale was needed,~~ and hence Apart from ^{raising} morale, Lincoln would ^{also} not have been able to blatantly condemn or threaten the Confederacy which would frustrate them further and make their chances of permanent secession more likely. This can be seen through his declaration that only 'insurrectionary' states would secede, but ~~is said not~~ ~~considering the fact seceded states 'insurrectionary'~~ that the seceded states are no such thing for he believes that the Union is still 'unbroken.' Hence, B's assertion that Lincoln's inaugural address was short sighted carries ^{much} ^{and weight} ^{merit} as Lincoln was under immense pressure to reunite the Union and had to coerce the Confederacy into rejoining the Union by playing on their American patriotism. B bluntly proclaims 'there can be no result except a collision' if attempting to repossess annexed Union property by the Confederacy, accurately summing up ~~the~~ ~~f~~ its contrasting views to Lincoln's address in Source A and the flaws of Lincoln's excessively placating, implicit tone.

Sources A, C, D refute the thesis that Lincoln's inaugural address was bound to lead to war. In A, Lincoln ~~makes~~ firmly says that he will preserve the Union by forcefully using his power to 'hold, occupy and possess the property ... belonging to the government' – a direct reference to annexed Union property by the Confederacy which Lincoln views as still part of the Confederacy. ~~This~~ Whilst not directly answering the thesis that this was bound to lead to war, there is still reference to a degree of forcefulness as Lincoln does not mention anywhere in the extract that the Confederacy has any choice at all in accepting or

Example candidate response – high, continued

denying his reclamation of rightful 'Union' property, i.e. the Confederacy will have to accept the repossession whether they like it or not. So while it does not directly address the fact this ~~could~~ ^{would purely} lead to war, there is still a firmness that leaves no room for Confederate ~~opinion~~ opinion regarding the annexations, with the definite possibility of resistance from the Confederacy as a result. On the other hand, Source C very directly says that Lincoln's inaugural address has successfully averted war by giving the message of ~~the~~ the Union's willingness to adopt any policy to 'preserve the peace' which will prevent war. The source's reliability is questionable due to its excessively optimistic tone which doesn't factor in abolitionism ^{disgust at the speech} or even of Northern opinion, simply being the opinion of 1 mere senator. Douglas would ~~have~~ also have wanted to raise morale much like the motive of Source A, hiding any ~~se~~ misgivings on the possibility of war. This taints its reliability significantly. D is ~~more subtle~~, ~~accept~~ is very supportive of Lincoln's speech and condemns abolitionists for their attack on the speech that makes them look no better than secessionists who favor 'disunion.' However, it doesn't directly answer the question on whether Lincoln's address was bound to lead to war, and so cannot really be used to refute or support the thesis. ~~Further,~~

Overall, ~~the sources main~~ ^{A, C, D} although ~~the sources~~ / mainly agree that Lincoln's inaugural address was not bound to lead to war, ~~so~~ they cannot ~~what~~ be used to ~~wholly rep~~ their unreliability caused by the motives of the speakers/authors mean they cannot be used to support the notion. On the other hand, B's reliability due to the bluntness of the author means its ~~support~~ argument outweighs the other sources, refuting the

Example candidate response – high, continued

	Claims of the other 3 sources ^{and} answer the question the best.
--	--

Examiner comment – high

Part a

This response has a strong and clear focus on both the sources and the question asked. As a result, the candidate is able to compare and evaluate the sources and show similarities and differences between the two with specific reference to the ‘likelihood of secession leading to war’. This answer is awarded a mark at the bottom of Level 4. This is a strong response which could have been improved by making some of the evaluation a little more coherent. Overall, however, this is a clear and well-structured answer to the question.

Mark awarded for part a = 12 out of 15

Part b

This answer is strongly focused on both the sources and the question, and contains a real attempt to test how far the sources support the assertion that ‘President Lincoln’s inaugural address was bound to lead to war’. The candidate groups the sources into those which agree and those which disagree with the assertion, and this helps to make this response reach the higher levels of the mark scheme. The candidate is also able to appreciate the subtlety of the language in the question and uses the word ‘bound’ to test the sources, especially C. This is a sign that the candidate is really engaging with the material. The candidate makes various attempts to evaluate the source material, and although these are not always successful, they are enough to put the answer at the bottom of Level 4. A higher mark would have been awarded if the answer had made sure that the source evaluation was full and valid as well as being tied to the requirements of the question.

Mark awarded for part b = 16 out of 25

Total marks awarded = 28 out of 40

Example candidate response – middle

2A)	<p>source B contrasts source A to a considerable extent regarding the likelihood of succession leading to war. source A focuses whilst views succession as a unjust act towards the existance of the union it opposes the utilisation of violence to express convey this message whereas source B takes on a different position as it reiterates the inevitability of war as a result of succession.</p>
	<p>Source A and B do have some similarities as they both put heavy emphasis on the problem of succession as dividing the union. However, it is evident that there is not a misconception to regarding source A from source B's standpoint. Source A retains a conciliatory but firm tone as it denounces and condemns "lawfully getting out of the union." The use of firm, direct words ultimately acts as a warning by Lincoln regarding the issue of succession. The misinterpretation of this strong message is illustrated through source B's view that Lincoln's speech to conveys the message that "war is it must lead to war against the confederate states" through its implicit announcement of Lincoln's intentions, the source B greatly contrasts source A as they have two both diverging intentions. source B A is intended to accentuate the importance of the union and heighten the problem of succession as evoking "insurrectionary or revolutionary" acts</p>
	<p>Moreover there is a great contrast in tones used in source A and B. Source B retains a defensive and wincing tone in its attempt to rebut Lincoln's assertion that there needs to be "no bloodshed or violence." The explicit condemnation of violence as a form of solution clearly exhibits Lincoln's view of succession leading to war as unlikely as he denounces any revolutionary means to consolidate the problem. The source B contrasts this as it</p>

Example candidate response – middle, continued

	<p>construes the message as Lincoln declares to "treat those states like nothing as though they were part of the union!" The speech by senate thomas clingman categorises the Lincoln's motives as to disregard the seceding states in order to preserve the union.</p> <p>following this notion it is evident that source B views the issue of secession as an instigation of war. as there has not been nearly emphasis on the issue the seriousness of secession as a whole but has been an attempted to be dismissed in the efforts of saving the union by Lincoln. Although the speech is derived from south carolina and thus is subjective in its vehement defense of secession, Lincoln did regard secession as part of a slave power conspiracy an regarding to a small section of southern planters as the root for secession. considering this, although Lincoln did not explicitly announce his view of secession as a a passing problem in which he thought would eventually die out, there are is an underlying consensus of this new through his constant emphasis on the preservation of the union. This ultimately categorises Lincoln's speech (source A) as an underlying confirmation to the inevitability of war, whilst source B explicitly condemns Lincoln's claim and takes on the position that there can be no "result" "except a willision".</p>
	<p>conclusively whilst source A and B contrast each other, they retain some similarities, source A implicitly announces the the secession as an eventual root of war through Lincoln's focus on the union and little required threat to take necessary action to prevent secession. source B gives a more explicit statement regarding it as war.</p>

Example candidate response – middle, continued

2B.	<p>Sources B and the support the view that Lincoln's inaugural address was bound to lead to war, however, sources C and D do not categorise Lincoln's speech as leading to the war war. This is illustrated through the disparity in tone assumed by sources C, D and A in contrast to B.</p>
	<p>whilst there are varying degrees to ^{to} the extent in which they view Lincoln's speech as an instigation of war, source C retains a strong defensive and particularly subjective tone towards the Lincoln's speech as it construes Lincoln's intentions in order to expose to problem in preserving the union, the deputy senator Thomas Clingman views the preservation of the union as a direct threat to the existence of secession through his assertion "he can hold them only by dispossessing dispossessing the state authorities"; this explicitly highlights the view that Lincoln's inaugural speech support will ultimately lead to war. However, in contrast to this source D takes on a more moderate ^{extreme} view due to its northern nature as derived from the observer: This contrasts source B as its intention differ, it proclaims that this this "paper is as bitter against Lincoln for not declaring war" whilst it denounces Lincoln's inability to declare war it ultimately supports the notion that Lincoln's speech was not a direct cause of war, further supporting this source C retains a more moderate view however also condemns states that Lincoln's the speech did not directly lead to war but rather his speech proposed a "peaceful solution" whilst sources C and D both contrast in terms of its intentions, source A to carefully examine and rebut in Lincoln's speech in a the subjective manner and source D to condemn both Lincoln's inability to instigate war and to</p> <p>The credibility of source D is hindered through its excessively, strong and extreme view as derived from a</p>

Example candidate response – middle, continued

	<p>however published paper. It goes against both the secessionists and Lincoln in the condemnation of Lincoln's inability to declare war and the "secessionists abuse of him" it provides both sides of the argument and thus can be classified as an objective view whilst stating that the two are acting "together in disunion" moreover source A source A contrasts this point as its primary focus is to unite the union and prohibit violence "unless forced on the nationed all though" the suggestion of using violence if extreme threat is seen to be on the union could ultimately classify Lincoln's speech as supporting the the likelihood of war. The conciliatory but firm tone could be misinterpreted as a direct threat to the seceding states. moreover the source C is derived from Illinois and is announced by Senator Douglas who participated in the Lincoln Douglas debates although he opposed Lincoln, the tone can be seen as objective and understanding through "After examination" this evidently illustrates his attempt to achieve a non-biased opinion as a result of Lincoln's speech.</p> <p>Conclusively source B takes on the position that Lincoln caused war inevitably through his disregard of the union, source B A C and D take the stance that Lincoln's speech was not intended to instigate war but rather prevent it as it is important to note Lincoln's true intentions encompassed the preservation of the union. source A further highlights the importance of the union and uses simple, clear language to get this point across thus it could be seen as instigating war interpreted by the seceding states or as defending the union as interpreted by northern states as in Lincoln's now divided speech he proclaimed "a house divided cannot stand it must either be all free or all slave"</p>
--	--

Examiner comment – middle

Part a

This response is able to concentrate on using the sources and makes a good attempt at looking for similarities and differences between the two. The answer makes some strong points about the differences and is able to illustrate these using content from the sources. There is also enough explanation of similarities to place the answer at the bottom of Level 3 in the mark scheme. In order to move further up the mark range the answer would need to be more precise in the use of contextual knowledge and explain the similarities and differences more clearly. As the marking suggests, the answer is a little confused at times and needed to be much clearer.

Mark awarded for part a = 8 out of 15

Part b

The answer starts clearly by briefly sorting the sources into those which agree and those which disagree with the assertion given in the question. The response then goes on to analyse the sources, but struggles to demonstrate any clear understanding of their content and tone. For example, there is some confusion over the origin of Source D. In the rest of the answer, the candidate is able to use the sources to support and challenge the assertion and so is awarded a mark within Level 3. However, the slightly confused attempts at evaluation do not aid the response and so cannot be awarded any marks. For a higher mark, the answer would need a clearer structure which would enable the evaluation to be clearly linked to arguments about whether the sources support or challenge the assertion.

Mark awarded for part b = 11 out of 25

Total marks awarded = 19 out of 40

Example candidate response – low

2a) Source A, spoken by Lincoln on his inauguration is absolutely certain that secession will be completely avoided and hence has no chance of leading to a war. The source focuses on the ultimate preservation of the Union which in turn will prevent a war based on secession. Lincoln stresses no blood shed and violence taking place between the North and the South, however from contextual knowledge we do know that Lincoln's election itself had caused anger from the South as they thought him a rampant abolitionist. Lincoln's inaugural speech is strict on the basis that the likelihood of secession and war is minimal which is later contrasted by Source B.

Source B is a reaction to Source A and disagrees on much that is stated. Firstly, Source B is certain that war is inevitable based on Lincoln's purpose to 'hold, occupy and possess the forts and arsenals' of the Confederate States, this is unlikely to be done without creating conflict between the two sides and creating actions that may lead towards war. The source even plainly states that this eventually will lead to a 'collision' or war.

Sources A and B disagree to a great extent on the likelihood of secession and war. Source A believes that secession is impossible with Lincoln's policy in place; no violence will erupt between the North and the South, Source B on the other hand is certain that Lincoln's policies and promises mentioned in Source A cannot be kept and war is inevitable between the two sides. However, both sources do not explicitly refer to secession – at

Example candidate response – low, continued

all, instead just mentioning the likelihood of a war breaking out or not. The sources agree that secession is not considered an issue but disagree massively on the likelihood of a war breaking out. Source A believes war is impossible while source B agrees that it is inevitable.

2b) Sources A and C are for the assertion that Lincoln has pledged to keep peace with his inaugural speech. Source A is a primary source from Lincoln himself that announces his commitments to the union and keeping peace between the North and the South. However, although Lincoln's intentions were good with a promise of 'no violence' we know that he could not keep his promise from contextual knowledge. The secession of South Carolina later in July 1861 had been a result of much discontent building up directly after Lincoln's election and a Republican victory. The Southerners had thought of Lincoln as a rampant abolitionist since they did not know much of Lincoln's supporters nor of the man himself. The fact that it was actually Lincoln's election that had caused discontent and none of these promises upheld it is not right to use this source as strong evidence against a war breaking out as his election was to an extent binding America to war, Lincoln's inaugural address had little impact on the road to war as the South already disliked him and was sure to dismiss what he said. Also, the speech is purely promotional of Lincoln's ideas and himself as an individual, so on that basis it cannot be seen as reliable as it only focuses on ~~one~~ Lincoln's point of view. It is observed that Lincoln was naive in not seeing secession coming.

Example candidate response – low, continued

2b) Source C is more usable as it is from a Democratic point of view and Lincoln's opposition, Douglas, as a leader of the Northern Democrats is correct in assuming that Lincoln was not going to bring the peace, however he too was not expecting the secession of the South to follow Lincoln's address to the country. The source is very basic on how Lincoln's speech is an omen of peace and does not touch on any of the South's discontent which is an oversight of the source.

Source B is a Southern source and hence it would have its objection to Lincoln naturally which is an omen of Henry regarding it's trust. However, it is realistic and points out that Lincoln is wrong to assume that peace is widespread across the country. The South had been discontent since his election and were right to know that many dis-agreements were coming.

Source D is more convoluted as it states that secessionists believe that Lincoln had announced war with his inauguration and then offers the viewpoint of the Free Anti-slavery party to show that the speech was made with face turned towards the South. Overall it can be taken that secessionists were more eager for war.

Overall, sources A and C disagree with the assumption that war was coming however A is less trusting as it is from Lincoln and is propaganda. Sources B and D are more certain that war was

Example candidate response – low, continued

	coming. The overall assumption is that Lincoln's speech
	was not important in the coming of war but his
	election and the discontent of the South was.

Examiner comment – low

Part a

The answer starts with an extended description of Source A and then goes on to compare Source B and explain the differences between the two sources. The candidate has a good understanding of the sources so the answer is awarded a mark at the top of Level 2. However, the candidate does not highlight any valid similarities between the two sources. For a higher mark, the response would need to look at both the similarities and the differences between the sources, and attempt to use source evaluation to contrast them.

Mark awarded for part a = 7 out of 15

Part b

The response opens with reference to Lincoln keeping the peace, which is not really the focus of the question and shows that the candidate has not quite got to grips with the requirements of this section. The candidate then discusses the issue of war and peace in 1861 but without direct reference to the sources. As a result of some confusion over what the question is asking, the sources are not really used to support or challenge the assertion and so the answer is awarded a mark at the top of Level 1. For a higher mark, the response would look more closely at the question and use the sources to directly agree or disagree with the assertion. Contextual knowledge is needed to support this rather than large chunks of general knowledge.

Mark awarded for part b = 5 out of 25

Total marks awarded = 12 out of 40